

April 3, 1975

not result in additional cost to the company. It should not, the company should not lend the money in a losing proposition. It is more than it costs them to administer the administrative requirements of dispensing the loans. I think that also it should not be an item of profit for the insurance company. It is part of the bargaining transaction. This bill has had a relatively easy flow through this legislature. It was one of the latest bills to be introduced and one of the earliest bills out of the banking committee. It was scheduled on the agenda as a non-controversial bill. I assume because insurance companies have a rather substantial influence on the banking committee and it was probably also presumed that they have substantial influence on this legislature. That is why this bill should be non-controversial. I assume that it is why it was put on the non-controversial list. Because, there is no debate on non-controversial and I assume that someone thought that there should be no debate or question on this bill. But there are big questions. Another thing that the bill does, is eliminates a simple word specified. So that when you purchase a policy of insurance they would no longer have to specify what the maximum rate of interest that they would charge you on a loan would be. I checked this with my own policy, Senator Stoney indicates that the reason for eliminating the specification is in order that they can charge you a lower rate of interest. My policy currently reads that if I choose to borrow against it that they will charge me not more than 6%. They specify the maximal amount and they may charge me less. What he wants it to say is that they may not charge me more than whatever they want to charge me. If they can't want to specify it at all. Certainly I think that the only purpose of the bill is to raise the interest rate to 8%, that is what they will all charge, that is what they want, and that is why the bill was introduced. I don't think that it is justified. I read the transcript of the committee hearing and I found absolutely no justification in the testimony for this. It is purely, and unequivocally a design by the insurance companies of this state to use the loan method to their policy holders as an added method of profit. Now Senator Stoney talks about the return to the policy holders of mutual companies. Certainly there may be some difference in return if the interest rate were increased and if loans against policies were lessened as a result of an increase in interest rates. That the companies could use the money in more productive ways. There are also stock companies, a great many stock companies, which the policyholders would not be subject to those direct benefits. So the issue is not as clear as Senator Stoney would have you believe. It is not as simple and I certainly don't see the policyholders of the state of Nebraska are benefited by this piece of legislation.

PRESIDENT: Senator Mills.

SENATOR MILLS: Mr. President, members of the body, I would like to clarify for Senator Cavanaugh that not all of us that serve on the banking and insurance committee are agents thereof, or bend backwards to the whims and wishes of insurance companies. However, if you will note on the committee report that there was one vote no, and that happened to be mine and I would like to tell this body why, and that is as